

Commissioner for Patents

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 8 and 12. These sheets replace the original sheets. These amendments are being made to clarify the drawings to be more consistent with the disclosure in the specification.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets  
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

Commissioner for Patents

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 to 7 remain in the application.

In the Office Action the Examiner questioned the construction of the display frame and particularly its integration into the wire mesh walls of the shopping cart. Figures 8 and 12 have been modified to remove some ambiguity which led to this questioning.

The Abstract has been revised to reduce the length thereof to be consistent with the requirements under 37 CFR 1.72 and Section 608.01(b) of the MPEP.

The disclosure was also amended to overcome some indefiniteness noted by the Examiner. Additional modifications have also been made by Applicant to further remove indefiniteness as noted which led to some confusion. It is pointed out to the Examiner that it is clear from the drawings as originally filed that the reinforced display frame is integrated in the wall and therefore lies within the plane of the walls. This is clearly disclosed in paragraph [00034]. It is also clear that the wire rods are welded to the channels of the frame. It is pointed out to the Examiner that the frame wires are not cut out to effect this integration. This integration is made when the walls of the shopping cart are fabricated wherein the wires are positioned about the reinforced steel frame in a jig and are then automatically welded by robots. This is the standard manufacturing in the industry. However, paragraph [00034] was revised to remove some ambiguity therefrom. If the Examiner refers to informal Figure 8 as originally filed, he will note that there were no wire rods at the front end of the reinforced display frame to provide access for the insertion of the promotional sheets and that the draftsman, when preparing formal drawings inserted these additional wire rods. This was an error which has now been corrected and which has led to some confusion, as rightly noted by the Examiner.

Claim 1 was revised to overcome objections raised under 35 U.S.C. 112 and it is believed that all of the objections have been addressed and that the amended wording should now remove the indefiniteness noted and is acceptable to the Examiner.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his detailed review of the specification and having noted the inconsistencies which have now been corrected. It is

Commissioner for Patents

therefore believed that this application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly

Respectfully submitted,  
ANTOINE TRUBIANO

By:



July 12, 2005


(Date)

---


Guy J. Houle (Reg. No. 24,971)  
Agent of Record  
OGILVY RENAULT LLP  
1981 McGill College Avenue, Suite 1600  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2Y3  
Tel.: (514)847-4321

Enc.

5 / 6




*Fig. 8*





*Fig. 9*


6 / 6



*Fig. 10*



*Fig. 11*



*Fig. 12*